

University of Groningen

Ex instructione manualium ... ex vera ratione

Irving, Andrew J. M.

Published in:
Irrtum – Error – Erreur

DOI:
[10.1515/9783110592191-028](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110592191-028)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2018

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Irving, A. J. M. (2018). Ex instructione manualium ... ex vera ratione: The Correction of Liturgical Errors in the Late Middle Ages. In A. Speer, & M. Mauriège (Eds.), *Irrtum – Error – Erreur* (pp. 507-528). (Miscellanea Mediaevalia; Vol. 40). De Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110592191-028>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

“*Ex instructione manualium [...] ex vera ratione.*”
Correction of Liturgical Errors in the Late Middle Ages

ANDREW J. M. IRVING (Groningen)

“Many priests, even if they had taught [or, learnt] the office of the mass in one way, would go about celebrating it in another.”¹ So begins rather abruptly Henry of Langenstein’s late-fourteenth-century treatise, the ‘Tractatus de modo procedendi in missa’, commonly entitled the ‘Secreta sacerdotum’. Henry continues,

“Their ignorance should not, therefore, be imputed to them, since they have learned hardly anything from their manuals. For this reason, I shall write down in order certain ways of celebrating the mass that I have seen that I do not like [...] so that of the two paths the reader of this document might walk along the one more pleasing to

¹ München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 18552a, foll. 197r–205r (hereafter, M), at fol. 197r: “*Sacerdotes plures circa officium misse aliter procederent etsi aliter docuissent.*” Two manuscripts of the text were consulted: M (fifteenth-century; provenance: Tegernsee), and Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, XX.A.16 (formerly, Admont, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 335), URL: <http://v2.manuscriptorium.com/apps/main/en/index.php?request=show_tei_digidoc&docId=set04052430> (last access on December 31, 2016), foll. 16v–22v. Early printed editions all derive from the fifteenth-century edition of Michael Lochmair, who appears to have altered little of Langenstein’s text; printed editions consulted: ed. Johann Froschauer, Augsburg 1497 (GW 12248), URL: <<http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00039424/images/>> (last access on December 31, 2016); and ed. Hieronymus Hölzel, Nuremberg 1507 (VD16 H 2138), URL <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0001/bsb00010071/image_1> (last access on December 31, 2016). In registers of Langenstein’s works, the incipit is recorded slightly differently: “*Sacerdotes plures circa officium missae aliter procederent si aliter didicissent*”; cf. T. Hohmann, Initienregister der Werke Heinrichs von Langenstein, in: *Traditio* 32 (1976), 399–426, at 417 (nr. 207); K. J. Heilig, Kritische Studien zum Schrifttum der beiden Heinriche von Hessen, in: *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 11 (1932), 105–176, at 153 sq. Adolph Franz, referring to the work, concludes the incipit in accord with the manuscript tradition: “*et si aliter docuissent*”, but appends “[für *didicissent*]”: id., *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens*, Freiburg i. Br. 1902, 520, nt 4. This variant appears, however, in none of the versions I have consulted. While the meaning “they had learnt” would seem to make more sense here than “they had taught” (whom did many priests teach about the celebration of the mass?), emendation of the textual tradition may not, in fact, be necessary since in late medieval Latin *docere* can be employed to mean “to learn”; cf. B. Löfstedt, Notizen eines Latinisten zu Luthers Predigten, in: *Årsbok of Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund* (1985), 24–42, at 31; P. Stotz, *Handbuch zur lateinischen Sprache des Mittelalters*, vol. 2: *Bedeutungswandel und Wortbildung* (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* II/5,2), München 2005, 146 (§ 74, 5); H. Antony (ed.), *Mittellateinische Wörterbuch bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert*, vol. 3: D–E, München 2007, col. 912.

him; some base their ways on the teaching of manuals, but the rest (and this is more commendable) base them on true reason”²

This essay shall explore exactly what the university theologian and administrator Henry of Langenstein (1327–1397) might have had in mind when he referred to these two paths³. This is not quite as neat a dichotomy as truth and falsehood. Error is not named as such by the author, and at the outset Henry seems at least somewhat reticent to criticize overtly the liturgical practices of priests whom he has observed. Nevertheless, the implication of ritual error holds: we are left to understand that it is because priests hardly learn anything at all from their manuals that they celebrate the mass in a way that surely they would not choose if only they knew better, and Henry is only too willing, of course, to show them another path. Deficit on the one hand and benefit on the other are quietly but firmly implied when Henry wryly suggests that the choice between the two paths is entirely that of his reader. But Henry’s irenic (or perhaps ironic) tone can hardly mask three questions that underlie the complicated matter of manifold ritual practices and the methods, means, and execution of ritual training for late medieval priests: What is it that priests are doing wrong? What is wrong with the manuals? And how are these questions to be adjudicated?

In the first section of this paper, we shall consider some examples of the sort of thing that Henry may have had in mind when he used of the term “*manuale*”, and the methods with which these texts sought to furnish priests who were anxious to avoid, correct, or adequately and appropriately cope with errors in the celebration of Eucharist. In the second section, we shall turn to Henry’s own concerns and methods as they are articulated in his short treatise, the ‘*Secreta sacerdotum*’.

I.

When attempting to understand what Henry might have meant by the term “*manuale*”, it would seem, at first, obvious to turn to the liturgical handbooks that styled themselves *manualia* as such. As least early as the twelfth century, this

² M, fol. 197r: “ideo non est eis imputandum quod nesciunt, quia a suis manualibus minime didicerunt. Unde per ordinem scribam quosdam modos quos vidi mihi displicentes [...] ut visis duabus viis hanc que magis placet lectori huius cartule gradiatur. Habent enim quidam ex instructione manualium, ceteri vero, quod laudabilius est, ex vera ratione.”

³ For Henry’s life, cf. G. Kreuzer, Heinrich von Langenstein: Studien zur Biographie und zu den Schismatraktaten unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Epistola pacis und der Epistola concilii pacis, Paderborn 1987, 47–149; T. Hohmann/G. Kreuzer, Heinrich von Langenstein, in: Die deutsche Literatur des Mittelalters Verfasserlexikon, vol. 3, Berlin–New York ²1981, 763–773; F. Vandenbroucke, Henri de Langenstein, in: Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique, vol. 7/1, Paris 1969, 215–219; O. Hartwig, Henricus de Langenstein dictus de Hassia: Zwei Untersuchungen über das Leben und die Schriften Heinrichs von Langenstein, Marburg 1857.

term was employed to refer to, among other things, a book that could be held in the hand of the celebrant or his attendant during the celebration of a number of liturgical rituals⁴. The manuals contained in varying orders the rubrics, prayer texts, and chants for catechetical rites, baptisms, nuptial blessings, the visitation and anointing of the sick and dying, burials, and various other blessings and pastoral liturgies. The content of the *manuale* was not limited to occasional rites, however. The fourteenth-fifteenth century ‘Manuale ad usum sacerdotis hebdomedarii’, formerly belonging to the Carthusian community of St. Michael near Mainz⁵, contains, for example, antiphons, short readings, and prayers for use in the regular cycle of weekly liturgical celebrations throughout the year. Not infrequently, such handbooks included material relating to the celebration of the mass, including votive mass propers, prefaces, and the Eucharistic Canon (though not, usually, the full cycle of propers). Indeed, a comment on the word “*manuale*” by the anonymous glossator to Eberhard of Béthune’s grammatical poem *Graecismus* suggests that for this fifteenth-century commentator at least the term was even primarily associated with Eucharistic celebrations: “*inde ‘manuale’ idem est quod ‘missale’ quia in manuale omnia que sunt necessaria ad missam celebrandam ad manum et promptitudinem habentur.*”⁶

The growth of this genre in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries does not imply a single source, nor anything like textual uniformity. While such manuals often reflected in some wise the custom of the cathedral church of the diocese for which they were produced⁷, even within a diocese they were highly variable

⁴ Cf. C. Du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*, edd. P. Carpentier/J. C. Adelung/G. A. L. Henschel, Paris ²1883–1887, at 237. For an early use of the term “*manuale*” to describe a book held during ritual performance, cf. the twelfth-century *Liber ordinis Sancti Victoris Parisiensis*, 67 (De unctione infirmorum), edd. L. Jocqué/L. Milis (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 61), Turnhout 1984, 258: “*Post haec abbas, excutus cappa, suscipiet stolam ab armario et ipse armarius tenet manuale*”; and 68 (De fratre moriente), 262 and 264: “*Sacrista uero abbati deferat stolam et manuale [...] Finito tamen psalmo quem inceperant, tunc abbas resummat stolam et, aspergens corpus aqua benedicta et turificans, dicat pro eo, quod manuale docet.*” A similar reference is preserved in the thirteenth-century Benedictine Eynsham Customary: The Customary of the Benedictine Abbey of Eynsham in Oxfordshire, ed. A. Grandsen (Corpus Consuetudinum Monasticarum 2), Siegburg 1963, 176, 12. A number of English diocesan statutes from the second half of the thirteenth century make it a duty of parishioners to furnish their churches with a manual: cf. A. J. Collins, *Manuale ad usum percelebris ecclesie sarisburiensis* (Henry Bradshaw Society 91), Chichester 1960, viii, nt 10.

⁵ Mainz, Wissenschaftliche Stadtbibliothek, Hs I 123; cf. G. List/G. Powitz, *Die Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Mainz*, vol. 1, Wiesbaden 1990, 218 sqq., URL: <<http://www.manuscripta-mediaevalia.de/dokumente/html/hsk0088>> (last access on December 31, 2016).

⁶ Glosa super ‘*Graecismus*’ Eberhardi Bethuniensis, 2 (de vitis), 2.9 (Acrylogia), ed. A. Grondeux (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 225), Turnhout 2010, 162.

⁷ Cf. for example: *Manuale secundum usum Rothomagensis* [Rouen] preserved in Rouen, Bibliothèque Jacques Villon, Ms. 380 (s. XIV); *Manuale secundum usum Ebrouicensis ordinatum* [Évreux], Rouen, Bibliothèque Jacques Villon, Ms. 381 (s. XV); *Manuale secundum usum Andegavensem* [Angers] preserved in Angers, Bibliothèque municipale, Ms. 83 (s. XV), URL: <http://bvmm.irht.cnrs.fr/consult/consult.php?COMPOSITION_ID=3196&corpus=manuscrit> (last accessed on December 31, 2016).

in their organization, scope, and in the selection or, at times, versions of texts they contained. For this very reason, the manuscript tradition of *manualia* has proven difficult to edit. Incunable and early printed editions do, however, supply some insight into the kind of instruction that such a manual might be supposed to have offered a parish priest. We may take as a widely disseminated and well-known example of the genre, the ‘Manuale ad usum percelebris ecclesie sarisburiensis’, the ‘Sarum Manual’⁸.

It must be conceded at the outset that if this is the kind of text that Henry had in mind, the celebrant of the mass would indeed learn “*minime*” about what displeasing methods he should avoid in the celebration of the mass. Rubrical material that would guide the celebrant in the way in which to celebrate the Eucharist comprises only the slenderest section of the work, and in these few pages beyond the provision of texts necessary for the execution of the rite, instruction is limited to succinct, and rather matter-of-fact rubrics: when to make inclinations and signs of the cross, when to raise the host and the chalice, how to hold one’s hands and fingers, ritual kissings, the fraction, the peace, the communion, and the ablutions. The rubrics are, for the most part, positive: that is, they instruct the celebrant what to do, and do not countenance that in practice these instructions may not, for some reason (whether deliberately, negligently, or otherwise), be in fact carried out.

In three instances, however, rubrics of the ‘Sarum Manual’ do supply evidence of variant practices, which are mentioned only in order to be sharply condemned. The first concerns the way in which the priest is to elevate the host at the words “*Qui pridie*” shortly before the consecration⁹. The rubric specifies that the priest should elevate the as-yet unconsecrated host “a little” (*parumper*), for the reason that if he should raise it to such a height that the people standing behind him could see it, as some “silly” (*fatui*) priests do, the people would commit idolatry by adoring a simple piece of bread as though it were the Body of Christ: “*et in hoc peccant*”. The wording of the explanatory rubric seems to derive from William of Pagula’s *Oculus Sacerdotis*, a compendious handbook for parish priests composed in England sometime between 1320 and 1328¹⁰, and thus it constitutes a useful example of the excerption and recycling of pastoral literature in the body of rubrics copied into ritual handbooks for liturgical performance. The theological thrust of the interjection is almost a commonplace however: in the context of a silently recited Canon, the potential for this incorrectly performed liturgical gesture to be misunderstood and thereby to induce

⁸ Cf. the comparative edition of A. J. Collins, *Manuale ad usum percelebris ecclesie sarisburiensis* (nt. 4) [= *Manuale sarum*], 81–97.

⁹ *Manuale sarum* (nt. 4), 85.

¹⁰ Cf. L. E. Boyle, ‘The ‘*Oculus Sacerdotis*’ and Some other Works of William of Pagula: The Alexander Prize Essay, in: *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th series, 5 (1955), 81–110. The text as a whole lacks an edition; the passage in question is reproduced from London, British Library, Royal MS 6 E I, fol. 58r in: J. Wickham Legg, *Tracts on the Mass* (Henry Bradshaw Society 27), London 1904, 270.

the grave sin of idolatry in unsuspecting congregants is a matter of enduring and serious concern in nearly all of the texts we shall treat in this essay.

A second rubric¹¹, also seemingly edited from the ‘*Oculus Sacerdotis*’, provides a rather more detailed instruction about something that should not be done by priests in the celebration of the mass. Apparently, certain “silly” men were touching the host in the manner of breaking it (*modo fractionis*) before saying the consecratory formula “*Hoc est enim corpus meum*”. They did so in order to replicate, so they maintained, the order of the narrative itself, in which Christ first breaks the bread before handing it to his disciples saying, “This is my Body”. The rubric goes on to say that, according to these priests, the Church herself seems to err in failing to maintain the ritual order of the Gospel narrative: “*aliter facit ecclesia quam christus fecit: et sic ecclesia videtur errare et per consequens delinquit.*” To such an exceptionally detailed explanation both of what not to do, and, to the reasons priests give as a kind of objection, for doing it, is provided a peremptory scholastic response in the midst of the Canon: “*Solutio. Dicendum est quod ecclesia non delinquit.*” Although the word order may seem different in the gospel narrative, the text goes on to explain, in fact Christ broke the bread after the consecration and blessing; end of discussion. The ritual correction to the Church’s purported error is resolved by the demonstration that the would-be correctors have themselves made an error by misunderstanding the meaning (if not the word order) of the text.

The third negative admonition appears between the priest’s private prayers of adoration of the consecrated host and the priest’s communion¹². It warns the celebrant to keep from dragging out the celebration at this point (“*a nimia prolixitate tractandi*”), on account of certain people’s “whirling” thoughts. It is not clear whether it is the celebrant’s or the congregation’s lack of concentration that is the cause for concern; in any case, the priest should meditate on the Christological mysteries (the incarnation, nativity, passion, and death of Jesus Christ) and on the power of the sacrament, and forthwith receive the consecrated elements.

The three brief allusions to ritual behaviors to be avoided are each errors in the proper execution of the Eucharistic rite, and, more precisely, errors of commission. But each differ in the reason why they are to be avoided: in the first instance, the problem is a potentially harmful misunderstanding on the part of observers of the ritual gesture; in the second, a misunderstanding on the part of the ritual celebrant; and in the third, the human potential for wandering thoughts.

While examples of this sort of liturgical *manuale* entitled as such survive from England, Flanders, Germany, and northern France, where Henry received his

¹¹ Manuale Sarum (nt. 4), 86.

¹² Manuale Sarum (nt. 4), 93.

academic training and began his teaching and administrative career¹³, the term seems to be less commonly employed for this kind of book in the German speaking regions where Henry concluded his ministry¹⁴. This should give us some pause in assuming that it is to this type of liturgical book that the author of the ‘*Secreta sacerdotum*’ is referring. We might be closer to the mark in turning to the handbooks that also styled themselves “*manuale*”, but whose contents suggest an understanding of that term that drew more on the venerable tradition of enchiridia that aim to guide the general comportment of their readers’ lives than on those that cater for the exigencies of liturgical performance. Guidance concerning proper (and improper) behavior during the celebration of the mass, would naturally comprise a useful component of these increasingly popular little volumes intended as useful compendia of counsel for the day-to-day and occasional duties of the late-medieval parish priest¹⁵.

Rich material in this regard is found in the wildly popular ‘*Manuale parochialium sacerdotum*’, which received no fewer than eighteen printed editions before the turn of the sixteenth century¹⁶. This anonymous treatise begins rather

¹³ A relatively early record of a manual in Flanders is found in the treasure inventory of Onze-Lieve-Vrouwekerk in Bruges prepared in 1115 under the auspices of Provost Reinfried: “*Manuales* [sic] *I*” is listed; edition: *Mittelalterliche Schatzverzeichnisse*, vol. 1, ed. Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte in collaboration with B. Bischoff (Veröffentlichungen des Zentralinstituts für Kunstgeschichte in München 4), München 1967, 25,11.

¹⁴ In a survey of the volumes of edited surviving medieval book catalogues and treasure inventories from Austria and Germany and Switzerland the term “*manuale*” in this liturgical sense scarcely turns up at all.

¹⁵ For useful introductions to this genre cf. L.E. Boyle, *The Fourth Lateran Council and Manuals of Popular Theology*, in: T. J. Heffernan (ed.), *The Popular Literature of Medieval England* (Tennessee Studies in Literature 28), Knoxville 1985, 30–43; P. A. Dykema, *Handbooks for Pastors: Late Medieval Manuals for Parish Priests and Conrad Porta’s Pastorale Lutheri* (1582), in: R. J. Bast/A. C. Gow (eds.), *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History. Essays Presented to Heiko A. Oberman on his 70th Birthday*, Leiden–Boston–Köln 2000, 143–162, at esp. 144–147; and P. A. Dykema, *Conflicting Expectations: Parish Priests in Late Medieval Germany*, PhD Dissertation, University of Arizona 1998, URL: <<http://hdl.handle.net/10150/282607>> (last accessed, December 31, 2016), 142–167, 224–246.

¹⁶ The most extensive discussion of the work, which has largely escaped the attention of scholarship, is found in Dykema, *Conflicting Expectations* (nt. 15), 197–223. The precise date and origin of the treatise as a whole is yet to be determined, but on the basis of internal evidence, Peter Dykema has posited that it “could have been written as early as the mid-thirteenth century”; cf. Dykema, *Handbooks for Pastors* (nt. 15), 147, nt. 15, and id., *Conflicting Expectations* (nt. 15), 200, nt. 7. Later printings suggest a concentration in the ecclesiastical province of Mainz, but whether the text was originally composed in Germany remains unclear; cf. id., *Conflicting Expectations* (nt. 15), 199, nt. 6. For a complete list of editions (1485–1499), cf. the *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, URL: <<http://gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/docs/MANUALE.htm>> (last accessed on December 31, 2016). A manuscript copy of the work dated 1499 is preserved in Wien, Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Cod. 4758. The edition consulted for this essay is that printed in Strasbourg c. 1485 (GW number: M20703; ISTC number: im00217000). For digital images of this edition from the copy preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB-Ink M-136), cf. URL: <<http://daten.digital-sammlungen.de/~db/0007/bsb00070928/images/>> (last accessed on December 31, 2016).

forebodingly with an excerpt without attribution from certain *mandata sinodalia* found elsewhere at least as early as the mid-fourteenth century¹⁷.

“Since, on account of the ignorance of certain simple priests sometimes there are things that can incline to the harm of their own and others souls, we draw their attention to the following in brief [...] so that they may be informed in a straightforward way about what they must do.”¹⁸

As Peter Dykema has succinctly put it, “the one major point” of the work is “to convey to the priest: Do it this way!”¹⁹

The fourth chapter of the short work, treating the celebration of the Eucharist (“*De sacramento altaris*”), expresses a familiar concern about premature elevation of the host²⁰, but, as might be expected, the chapter includes a good deal more besides. Some time is spent discussing what the celebrant should do if he discovered that the chalice has been incorrectly prepared: if there is wine, but the celebrant forgot to add the water as required by the rite; or there is only water in the chalice, but no wine; or if there is neither wine nor water in the chalice. These are errors all of preparation and of omission. The problem of what to do if the properly prepared wine was found not to be in the chalice during the course of the celebration of the Eucharist exercised a great deal of priestly manualist writing and was occasioned perhaps by the custom of someone other than the priest celebrant preparing the chalice before the beginning of the celebration of the mass itself, or at some other point earlier in the celebration than offertory rituals²¹. Detailed solutions are provided for the celebrant concerning where precisely to recommence the ritual text, and when to add the elements according to the moment that the priest discovers the problem, because this moment entails significant sacramental implications for what precisely one is dealing with.

Unforeseen mishaps are also taken into account in the work. If, in the middle of reciting the Eucharistic Canon, the celebrant should suffer a nosebleed, he should mark the passage he was in the course of reciting with wax, stop the flow of blood with his hands, wash them in silence, and return precisely to the

¹⁷ Cf. e.g. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Latin 995, fol. 90r; catalogue URL: http://ccfr.bnf.fr/portailccfr/jsp/index_view_direct_anonymous.jsp?record=eadbam:EADC:NE0059387_FRBNFEAD00006256349060 (last accessed on 31 December, 2016).

¹⁸ Manuale sacerdotum parochialium, [prologue]: “*Quoniam ex quorundam simplicium ignorantia sacerdotum, aliquando quedam sunt que vergere possunt in suarum et aliorum periculum animarum, hoc eis sub brevitate notavimus ... ut bis que agere debent simpliciter informentur*”, URL: http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00070928/image_7 (last accessed on 31 December, 2016).

¹⁹ Dykema, *Conflicting Expectations* (nt. 15), 198 sq.

²⁰ Cf. Manuale sacerdotum parochialium, 4: “*Qui postquam hostiam super altare acceperit eam in altum non eleuet donec dixerit. Hoc est enim corpus meum*”, URL: http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00070928/image_12 (last accessed on December 31, 2016).

²¹ Cf. H. B. Meyer, *Luther und die Messe: Eine liturgiewissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das Verhältnis Luthers zum Meßwesen des späten Mittelalters* (Konfessionskundliche und Kontroverstheologische Studien 11), Paderborn 1965, 136.

marked place in the Canon – unless, that is, blood has spattered on his vestments or the altar linens, in which case they must be changed. If all of this takes too long, then another priest can take over at the carefully marked spot²². If a spider or fly should fall into the chalice the consumption of which might cause vomiting or physical harm, the priest should consume the wine and then, as part of the ablutions, wash the creature with wine and drink the washings²³. Afterwards, the creature should be extracted and burnt in the *sacrarium*. If the consecrated Blood should fall on the altar linens or vestments (an error of commission), the priest should suck the part of the cloth that has been stained (*sugenda est*), wash the linens, and drink both the first and the second washings. Another option, noted by the manual, is that the portion of the cloth stained by the Blood of Christ be torn out, and reserved with the relics with an appropriate label proclaiming “*super pannum istum cecidit sanguis christi*”²⁴. If the Blood should fall on the ground, wood, or stone, it should be licked up, the material scraped and thoroughly wiped, and the cloth employed should be reserved in a sacred place²⁵. This widely circulated instruction for how to cope with what was apparently a not-uncommon problem appears with almost identical wording at least as early as the mid-thirteenth-century statutes of Walter de Kirkham, Bishop of Durham²⁶. Lastly, the manual counsels that priestly vestments and altar linens (especially corporals and palls) not be washed only once a year, but whenever is convenient in a specially appointed vessel and, if possible, by some upstanding virgin, widow, or matron (except for corporals which are to be washed by priests only)²⁷.

Closely related to these instructions are a series of ‘Cautelae Missae’, sometimes entitled the ‘De defectibus missae’, the precise origins of which await scholarly clarification²⁸. The ‘Cautelae’ enjoyed wide circulation, in part because of their inclusion within many missals, being copied or printed either following the liturgical calendar, or, more commonly, before the *Ordo Missae*, or after the

²² Cf. *Manuale parochialium sacerdotum*, 4, URL: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00070928/image_11> (last accessed on December 31, 2016).

²³ Cf. *ibid.*: “*et vino superfuso illud quod cecidit abluatur, et ablutum a sacerdote vel ab alio bonam conscientiam habente sumatur*”, URL: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00070928/image_12> (last accessed on December 31, 2016).

²⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁵ Cf. *ibid.*: “*Si vero in terram vel lignum: vel lapidem ceciderit: lingendus, radendus et extergendus est locus ille et pannus in aliquo sacro loco abscondito reponendus*”, URL: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00070928/image_13> (last accessed on December 31, 2016).

²⁶ Cf. D. Wilkins, *Concilia magnae britannie et hiberniae a synodo Verolamiensi A.D. 446 ad Londinensem A.D. 1717*, ed. Londini 1737, vol. 1, 707.

²⁷ Cf. *Manuale parochialium sacerdotum* 4, URL: <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/bsb00070928/image_14> (last accessed on December 31, 2016)

²⁸ The *Cautelae Missae* are edited in: W. Maskell, *The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England according to the Uses of Sarum, York, Hereford, and Bangor, and the Roman Liturgy*, Oxford 1882, 238–247; Maskell’s prefatory comments on the origins of the *cautelae* on pages 234–237 in the same volume remain useful.

Canon. The text is divided into two sections: seven numbered *cautelae* are followed by a longer series of briefer unnumbered *cautelae* in a less clearly-discernible order.

Each of the seven numbered *cautelae* present a primary instruction, which serves as a kind of organizing principal to discuss both what to do and what errors to avoid. The opening *cautela* instructs the reader that the priest about to celebrate the mass “should prepare his conscience very well through a pure confession”²⁹: this is an occasion to instruct the priest to avoid both inner dispositional problems (he cannot credibly love God, who appears at the altar “*irreligiosus, indevotus, impudicus, distractus, vagus, aut desidiosus*”³⁰), and their outward manifestations (he should not lean on the altar, his crosses should be too high so as to avoid knocking over the chalice, and they should be made clearly and not look like circles). The admonition “not just to think but to be certain that he has the required matter”³¹, provides an occasion to treat formal questions of sacramental theology (vinegar is not proper matter; if there is more water than wine, the matter cannot be considered wine) and to offer practical hints (have a server taste the wine in advance to check whether it is suitable). The *cautela* concerning the consecratory form instructs the priest to say the words rather slowly and gives precise instructions on when to breathe. It does not seem “*rationabile*”, the text stipulates, to introduce breaks between the words of the consecratory formula, because in that way the sense is lost³². To cite two final examples: the priest should never consume the entire chalice in one gulp (*uno hausta*) lest this cause him to cough³³, and the priest should not wash his mouth or teeth before mass lest he swallow some water along with this saliva and thereby break his fast³⁴.

In the second section of the ‘Cautelae’ appear a number of concerns that are closely related to the problem-solving of errors arising in the celebration we have already seen. Much instruction is given, for example, regarding what to do if the priest should faint or die during the Canon³⁵: here again, a certain application of sacramental theology is at work in determining when and how an assistant priest should resume the prayer. We also see a new element: what to do in

²⁹ Cautelae Missae, ed. Maskell (nt. 28), 238: “*Prima cautela est: ut sacerdos missam celebraturus, conscientiam suam per puram confessionem optime praeparat [...]*.”

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid., 239: “*ut non putet sed certo sciat se debitas materias habere.*”

³² Cf. Cautelae Missae, ed. Maskell (nt. 28), 239 sq.: “*cum dixerit ‘Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes’ respiret; et uno spiritu tractim dicat ‘Hoc est enim corpus meum’. Sic non immisceat se alia cogitatio. Non enim videtur esse rationabile discontinuare formam tam brevem, tam arduam, tam efficacem, cujus tota virtus dependet ab ultimo verbo, scilicet, meum, quod in persona Christi dicitur [...]*.”

³³ Cf. ibid., 240: “*Quinta est, ut dum sumat, nunquam uno haustu calicemumat [...]*.”

³⁴ Cf. ibid., 241: “*Septima est, ut ante missam non os vel dentes lavet [...]*.”

³⁵ Cf. ibid., 242 sq.. The precise distinctions are: fainting before the Canon; fainting during the Canon, but before the consecration and transubstantiation; fainting “in actu consecrationis”; fainting during consecration and part of the formula is incomplete; fainting after the consecration of the Body, but before the consecration of the Blood.

cases of doubt when the celebrant is not sure whether he has made an error of omission or not³⁶. The text instructs the priest not to trouble himself if he does not remember whether he said some of the prayers, unless it was part of the form of consecration, in which case he should resume the consecration, for without the correct form there is no consecration. If he is not sure whether he left out some of the consecratory formula, he should in no wise undertake a conditional consecration; rather, “*sine temeraria assertione*”, he should resume the entire formula over the proper matter with the specific intention that if the consecration had taken place, he does not wish to consecrate, but if it had not taken place, he does wish to consecrate³⁷.

In addition, we see in this text instructions about various penances to be performed: if the celebrant should spill the wine, if he should vomit up the Eucharist because of gluttony, if he does not keep the sacrament from mice or other animals, if he loses and is not able to find some of the sacrament. The precise prescription of variable degrees of penance recalls not only the distant ancestry of the ‘Cautelae’ in early-medieval penitential literature, statutes, and constitutions³⁸, but also points to the transmission and reception of such legislation in books that late medieval parish priests had daily to hand to guide them in liturgical celebrations. Perhaps, it should not surprise us then to find in the ‘Cautelae’ references by name to three learned thirteenth-century commentaries on canon law: the ‘Apparatus’ of Innocent IV (Sinbaldo dei Fieschi) (c. 1245)³⁹, the ‘Summa aurea’ (c. 1253)⁴⁰, and the ‘Commentary on the Decretals’ of Henricus de Segusio (Hostiensis).⁴¹ These highly specialized works are more invoked than rehearsed in the ‘Cautelae’. Innocent supplies, on two occasions, an alternative remedy for a problem during the recitation of the Canon⁴². The reader is

³⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 244: “*Si sacerdos non recolit se dixisse aliquid horum que debuit dicere [...]*.”

³⁷ *Ibid.*

³⁸ Cf. Maskell, *Ancient Liturgy* (nt. 28), 235 sqq.

³⁹ Cf. Innocentii Quarti Pontificis Maximi Super libros quinque Decretalium cum indice peculiari nunc recens collecto, novisque insuper Summariis additis, et Margarita Baldi de Ubaldis Perusini [= Apparatus], ed. Francofurti 1570. The Frankfurt edition is available in full online, URL: <https://works.bepress.com/david_freidenreich/46/> (last accessed on December 31, 2016).

⁴⁰ Cf. Summa domini Henrici cardinalis Hostiensis [= Summa aurea], ed. Lugduni 1537 [Reprint: Aalen 1962].

⁴¹ Cf. Henrici de Segusio cardinalis Hostiensis Decretalium commentaria, 6 vols., ed. Venetiis 1581 [Reprint: Torino 1965 in 2 vols.], vol. 2, foll. 160v–166v (In Tertio Decretalium librum commentaria, De celebratione missarum).

⁴² Cf. Cautelae Missae, ed. Maskell (nt. 28), 242: “*Si autem sacerdos in actu consecrationis deficiat, verbis aliquibus iam prolatis, sed in toto non completis, secundum Innocentium, alius sacerdos debet incipere ab illo loco, ‘Qui pridie’*”; cf. Innocent IV, Apparatus, I, 16, 3, ed. Francofurti 1570, fol. 106v. When the author advises what the celebrant should do if he realizes that there is no wine in the chalice only after receiving the consecrated Body (Cautelae Missale, 243), he observes that, according to the “*doctores*”, the priest should recommence from the beginning of the Institution Narrative (“*Qui pridie*”). This is not the only option however: “*Innocentius tamen dicit quod si ex prolongatione sacerdos timet scandalum, quo sufficiunt tantum illa verba per quae consecratur sanguis, scilicet ‘Simili modo’, et sic sumere sanguinem*”; cf. Innocent IV, Apparatus, III, 41, 6, fol. 452v.

referred to Hostiensis’s ‘*Summa aurea*’ for what to do with a mouthful of water if the celebrant discovers only at the moment of consumption that water is all that is in the chalice⁴³, and at the conclusion of the ‘*Cautelae*’ a reference is made to both the *Summa* and the ‘*Commentary on the Decretals*’ (*Lectura*) of Hostiensis for cases where the reader does not find the ‘*Cautelae*’ to be sufficiently complete⁴⁴. In these brief but learned citations, the ‘*Cautelae*’ served to guide the priest celebrant in a focused way to sophisticated scholastic treatments of law and theology and applied them to day-to-day errors of commission and omission in the celebration of the parochial Eucharist⁴⁵.

Perhaps the most outstanding example of this impulse to transmit up-to-date theological and canonical scholarship to parish priests is Guido of Monte Rochon’s ‘*Manipulus curatorum*’⁴⁶. Although little is known of the author save that he was a teacher and ecclesiastical administrator working in the Valencian town of Teruel in the early 1330s, the work enjoyed rapid and significant popularity: over 250 manuscripts and over 120 incunable editions survive⁴⁷. The work is explicitly intended as a practical guide for priests, especially young curates: the author styles it an “*opusculum de instructione neophitorum curatorum*”⁴⁸. It is purposefully written in a plain but serviceable style, and it is sufficiently brief to be able to be readily and easily consulted on the spot if indeed it was carried about in the hands of working priests, as Guido himself wrote that his title was intended to suggest⁴⁹.

Guido devotes the first part of the ‘*Manipulus*’ to the theology and administration of each of the sacraments with the exception of penance, which receives a more detailed treatment in a section of its own. Much of the treatment of the

⁴³ Cf. *Cautelae* Missae, ed. Maskell (nt. 28), 243: “*Require in summa Hostiensis in titulo de celebratione missae.*” Cf. *Summa aurea* (nt. 40), fol. 185v; I do not find, however, a discussion of this problem in this section of the ‘*Summa aurea*’.

⁴⁴ Cf. *Cautelae* Missae, ed. Maskell (nt. 28), 247: “*Item si qua hic desunt, requirantur in summa et lectura Hostiensis, in titulo de celebratione missarum.*”

⁴⁵ Cf. Th. Izbicki, *The Eucharist in Medieval Canon Law*, Cambridge 2015, for an important recent contribution to the study of the decretists’ contributions to late medieval Eucharistic theology.

⁴⁶ Cf. Guido of Monte Rochon, *Manipulus curatorum*; cf. M. W. Bloomfield, *Incipits of Latin Works on the Virtues and Vices, 1100–1500 A.D.* (The Mediaeval Academy of America Publication 88), Cambridge (Mass.) 1979, nr. 5019. The Latin text has not received a critical edition. Digital reproductions of a copy of the 1489 Venice edition preserved in Barcelona, Biblioteca de Catalunya, Inc. 95–8° can be consulted online at URL: <<http://www.europeana.eu/portal/en/record/91910/FD318D6CB8BFB66C5AE7D990BE557168BD625636.html>> (last accessed December 31, 2016); citations and folio references are from this edition and copy. The text has recently been translated into English; cf. Guido of Monte Rochon, *Handbook for Curates: A Late Medieval Manual on Pastoral Ministry*, transl. by A. T. Thayer (Medieval Texts in Translation), Washington (DC) 2012.

⁴⁷ Cf. *Handbook for Curates*, transl. Thayer (nt. 46), xiii.

⁴⁸ Guido of Monte Rochon, *Manipulus curatorum*, dedicatory letter, ed. Venetiis 1489 (nt. 46), fol. [5r] (transl. by Thayer [nt. 43], 3 sq.).

⁴⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, prologus, ed. 1489, fol. [5v]: “*volui manipulum curatorum vocari ex eo quod sacerdotes potissime curati debent istum libellum portare in manibus*” (transl. by Thayer, 6 sq.). The 1489 Venice edition contains 168 folios, and measures only 220mm in height (the size of a contemporary paperback).

Eucharist, in the Fourth Tractate of this first section, digests scholastic theological debate concerning the minister (ch. 2), matter (ch. 3), form (ch. 4), and effects (ch. 4) of the sacrament, and contains succinct references to Aristotle and to eminent contemporary scholars (Duns Scotus, Henry of Ghent, Bernard of Auvergne, Berengar of Ladorra). The chapters dedicated to vestments (ch. 8) and to the rite of the mass itself (ch. 10) provide not practical guidance, but traditional liturgical commentary on the significance of the ritual clothing and gestures of the kind seen in William Durandus and John Beleth, the latter being cited by name. These sections would seem to be less useful to have in hand to guide ritual performance or solve performance-related dilemmas than to serve as a tool of catechetical instruction.

Embedded in this series treating more theological matters are a number of chapters that reveal a like attention to practical questions arising from ritual performance. The place (ch. 5), time (ch. 6), and frequency (ch. 7) of the celebration of mass, and who may receive the sacrament (ch. 9), each receive careful treatment supported by highly succinct references to Gratian's 'Decretum'. In the eleventh and concluding chapter of the tractate⁵⁰, Guido turns to defects in the mass, and it is here that he offers his most detailed performance-related counsel. Much of this chapter concerns familiar problems in Eucharistic celebration: what should be done if the right matter is lacking in the chalice⁵¹, if dangerous foreign matter enter the chalice⁵², in the event of spillage⁵³, vomiting⁵⁴, inadvertent omission of part of the consecratory formula⁵⁵, or the death or incapacitation of the celebrant during the Canon⁵⁶.

As elsewhere in the work, however, the author also provides insight into his own particular interests. Given the amount of space dedicated to the sacrament of penance in the work as whole, it is perhaps unsurprising that Guido is particularly concerned to explore what should be done if the celebrant, having vested and proceeded with the celebration of the mass, remembers that he has committed a mortal sin that he has not confessed. Guido disagrees with the opinions of "some" (*quidam*) who argue that the priest "ought not to say the words of consecration, but ought to receive a simple host" (effectively deceiving the congregation), on the grounds that this would both constitute irreverence towards the sacrament and cause idolatry amongst the congregants. If he cannot delay the celebration, it will suffice, Guido argues, that he be contrite for his tardy repentance and intends to confess as soon as possible. If, however, he remembers that he has been excommunicated and has not yet proceeded with the consecration, he should create some (false) excuse, even feigning illness or

⁵⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 4, 11, foll. [32v]–[34v] (transl. Thayer, 102–108).

⁵¹ Cf. *ibid.*, foll. [32v]–[33r] (transl. by Thayer, 102 sq.).

⁵² Cf. *ibid.*, fol. [33r] (transl. by Thayer, 103).

⁵³ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. [33v] (transl. by Thayer, 104 sq.).

⁵⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. [33v] (transl. by Thayer, 105).

⁵⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. [34r] (transl. by Thayer, 106).

⁵⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. [34r] (transl. by Thayer, 107).

some other need, in order to avoid continuing with the celebration. If he cannot delay, he should be sorry, and purpose to obtain absolution. The author is careful to observe, however, that while⁵⁷ he believes that if the excommunicate celebrant acts in this way he will be absolved by the High Priest (Christ) “*quantum ad culpam*”, he will not in this section determine whether he is absolved “*quantum ad penam irregularitatis*”⁵⁸.

A more prosaic practical hint is offered when Guido provides a trick for coping with celebrating the mass in frigid temperatures, the very specificity of which bears the marks of personal experience. If the Blood should freeze in the chalice (presumably having been prepared before the mass), Guido recommends wrapping hot bread around the chalice, which in his opinion is a safer method of unfreezing the contents than breathing on it. If the hot bread is insufficient, the chalice should be placed in boiling water, care being taken, of course, not to let any water splash into the sacred vessel and thereby dilute its contents⁵⁹.

The treatise with which I shall conclude this section of my paper, the ‘*Speculum manuale sacerdotum*’ of the Augustinian hermit Hermannus de Scildis, is yet another example of a desire and a capacity to condense, transmit, and apply the learning of the university to problems and errors in the quotidian celebrations of the parish priest⁶⁰. Hermannus was born perhaps in Schildesche in Bielefeld, trained in Paris, and taught as professor of theology in Würzburg, before dying in 1357 shortly before Henry was to commence his own studies in Paris⁶¹. He divides his treatment of the “*speculanda circa sacramentum eucharistiae*” into three sections: matter, form, and the intention of the priest. Each of these “species”, as he terms them, are further subdivided into a series of admonitions of what should be done (*tenenda*) and a longer series of things that should be either improved (*emenda*) or avoided (*cavenda*).

Whereas Guido displays considerable facility in the application of contemporary scholarship to the problems confronted by novice priests, school training seems to have lent Hermannus a marked hesitancy in making definitions on matters regarding which he cannot be sure of the opinion of the “doctors”.

⁵⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. [33v] (transl. by Thayer, 105).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, fol. [34r] (transl. by Thayer, 106).

⁵⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. [34r] (transl. by Thayer, 107).

⁶⁰ Edition consulted: Hermannus de Scildis, *Speculum manuale sacerdotum*, ed. Treviris 1481; from digital reproductions of the copy preserved in München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Inc.c.a. 194, URL: <<http://www.mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn/resolver.pl?urn=urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb11303337-2>> (last accessed December 31, 2016). The work lacks chapter numbers, and neither the edition nor the copy has been foliated; the reader is referred to scan numbers 26–37 on this website.

⁶¹ For Hermannus’s life and works, cf. A. Zumkeller, Hermann von Schildesche, in: *Neue Deutsche Biographie* 8 (1969), 651, URL: <<http://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd118907263.html>> (last accessed December 31, 2016), and *id.*, *Schrifttum und Lehre des Hermann von Schildesche O.E.S.A. († 1357)* (Cassiacum 15), Würzburg 1959. The work has not received a critical edition. The incunable edition consulted is Hermannus de Scildis, *Speculum manuale sacerdotum* (nt. 60).

What is striking about his manual, however, is, on the one hand, the introduction of more or less quodlibetal problems that one senses have their origins in his own experience both as a university professor and as a religious administrator, and his cautious attempts to apply his learning to their resolution on the other. He refuses, for example, to pass judgment on whether brandy (*vinum sublimatum*) can be used as matter for the sacrament because the *doctores* have not mentioned this⁶². While he dares not define whether the consecratory form uttered in German or Hungarian confects the sacrament, he is aware that Armenians use a different ritual language and therefore wonders “*unde forte potest confici per verba alterius lingue a tribus prefatis* (sc. Latin, Greek, and Hebrew)”⁶³. In addition, he can be bracingly frank: in his treatment of the intention of the celebrant, he stipulates just how long a priest should abstain from celebration after a nocturnal emission, after “voluntary pollution”, after engaging in sexual intercourse (and repenting), and after being awake all night up to no good⁶⁴. (If he has spent the night studying, he may celebrate the mass, provided that he is not “*perturbatus in capite*”⁶⁵.) Hermannus concludes his treatment of the Eucharist with the series of “*remedia generalia contra omnes defectus et negligentias contra sacramentum*”⁶⁶. These we have seen elsewhere entitled ‘Cautelae’, albeit here Hermannus makes some realistic additions (what to do if you realize you are not wearing your stole or manipule when you are in the middle of mass, or that the candles are not lit⁶⁷), complete with references to Hostiensis.

II.

In what wise does Henry of Langenstein’s brief treatise differ from this substantial, albeit varied body of literature which would seem to proffer comprehensive instruction on the avoidance of and remedies for priestly liturgical error?

The work ‘*Secreta sacerdotum*’, which awaits edition, seems, both by its content and its manuscript distribution, to have been composed by Henry sometime after 1384 when he was called, together with numerous other former professors of the University of Paris, to the University of Vienna by Herzog Al-

⁶² Hermannus de Scildis, *Speculum manuale sacerdotum* (nt. 60), [scan 27], URL: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11303337_00027.html> (last accessed December 31, 2016).

⁶³ *Ibid.*, [scan 29], URL: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11303337_00029.html> (last accessed December 31, 2016).

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, [scan 31], URL: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11303337_00031.html> (last accessed December 31, 2016).

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, [scan 32]–[scan 37], URL: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11303337_00032.html> (last accessed December 31, 2016).

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, [scan 37], URL: <http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb11303337_00037.html> (last accessed December 31, 2016).

brecht III of Austria⁶⁸. His experience in Paris as procurator of the *Natio Anglicana* in 1363, and as vice-chancellor under Johannes de Calore (1371–1381), no doubt shaped his noted capacity as a university administrator in Vienna at a moment of critical restructuring and consolidation in the recently founded institution, first as Dean of the Faculty of Theology (1388) and then as Rector (1393–1394).

While the number of surviving manuscript copies of the work appears to be modest⁶⁹, numerous incunable and early printed editions survive of the text, all deriving from the redaction by Henry’s fifteenth-century successor in Vienna, Michael Lochmair (Dean of Theology: 1487; Rector: 1474, 1483⁷⁰), who seems to have altered the text little, save for the addition of tituli⁷¹. Although the provenance of extant manuscripts reveals an early circulation of the text among male, predominantly Benedictine communities, in the absence of an explicit letter of dedication it is difficult to determine whether Henry intended to ad-

⁶⁸ For biographical references, cf. supra nt. 3. Henry held a neutral position in the conflict between Urban VI and Clement VII at the outset of the Great Schism (1378). Because he refused to swear obedience to Clement VII, he was constrained to leave the University of Paris, probably by the end of 1382. Between this date and his arrival in Vienna, Henry resided in the Cistercian Abbey of Eberbach and in Worms.

⁶⁹ Preliminary research has identified eight fifteenth-century manuscripts, the earliest of which seems to be München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, clm. 18552A, foll. 197r–205v (= M). This manuscript is of Tegernsee provenance and was dated by Heilig to 1425: Heilig, *Kritische Studien* (nt. 1), 153. The connection between the University of Vienna and Tegernsee has been well documented; cf. D. D. Martin, *Fifteenth-Century Carthusian Reform: The World of Nicholas Kempf* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 49), Leiden–New York 1992, 104, nt. 94. Adolph Franz has documented the use of Henry’s text by the reform-minded prior of Tegernsee, Bernhard of Waging, in his *Ordinarium misse practicum* (1461–1462); cf. A. Franz, *Die Messe im deutschen Mittelalter: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Liturgie und des religiösen Volkslebens*, Freiburg i. Br. 1902, 522 and 575. Other manuscripts of the *Secreta sacerdotum*, all of Austrian origin, include: Berlin, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. theol. lat. qu. 271, foll. 6r–12v (1465–1470, Austria); Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. 248, foll. 137r–140r (Benediktinerstift St. Lambrecht, 1453); Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. 312, foll. 16r–21r (s. XV, Chorherrenstift Seckau); Graz, Universitätsbibliothek, Ms. 731, foll. 253r–261v ([14]71); Innsbruck, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek Tirol, Cod. 207, foll. 160v–166v (s. XV^m, Lower Austria); Praha, Národní knihovna České republiky, XX.A.16, foll. 16v–22v (= P; 1442; formerly Admont, Benediktinerstift, Cod. 335); Seitenstetten, Benediktinerstift, Stiftsbibliothek, Cod. 133, foll. 204r–208r (s. XV).

⁷⁰ For Michael Lochmair (Lochmayr, Lochmayer, Lochmaier), cf. *Verfasser Lexikon* (nt. 3), vol. 5, 891 sqq. After his second rectorship in 1483, Lochmair worked increasingly in Passau where he had been appointed a Domherr as early as 1473, and where he succeeded the celebrated Domprediger Paulus Wann († 1489).

⁷¹ The Universal Short Title Catalogue (USTC) lists twelve surviving incunable editions, the earliest dated 1491 (Passau; USTC reference nr: 745618); cf. also R. Schönberger (ed.), *Repertorium edierter Texte des Mittelalters aus dem Bereich der Philosophie und angrenzender Gebiete*, Berlin 2011, 1853 (Henricus de Langenstein), and 2839 (Michael Lochmaier). An earlier 1489 Heidelberg edition of the ‘*Secreta sacerdotum*’ is listed in Hain (L. Hain, *Repertorium bibliographicum*, vol. 2/1, Stuttgart 1831, nr. 8375–8388 [Hassia, Henricus de] at nr. 8379), but this edition cannot be verified; cf. *Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke*, URL: <<http://gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/docs/GWX658A.htm>> (last accessed, December 31, 2016).

dress a particular group of priests and, if so, whom. The incipit of the text which appears to refer to teaching and learning ("*aliter procederent etsi aliter docuissent*"⁷²), together with the brief apostrophe "*O piissimi domini et fratres*" toward the end of the text may hint, however, at an academic priestly audience⁷³.

While Henry proceeds "*per ordinem*" following the order of ritual actions and texts in the celebration of the mass like both the 'Manuale sacerdotum parochialium' and the first section of the 'Cautelae missae', his treatise differs significantly from these works and indeed the other manuals we have considered in this essay in its basis, scope, and detail.

First, whereas much of the manual literature cautions the implied reader about possible performance errors by recourse to widely received principals and texts of contemporary sacramental theology and canon law, and uses these to structure material, resolve questions, and serve as references for further consideration, for the most part, Henry eschews allusions to external written authorities. He refers instead repeatedly and primarily to his own experience, i. e., to what he has personally seen: "*quosdam modos quos vidi*". He has seen celebrants unnecessarily leaving the altar area while another priest is giving the sermon⁷⁴; priests whose recitation of the Canon is so slow that it agitates the congregants⁷⁵; celebrants who make the sign of the cross with the whole hand instead of with the index and middle fingers⁷⁶. He recounts the cautionary story of a certain priest who gazed up at the host for so long during the elevation that, because he was light-headed after a sermon and a long fast, he began to lose his balance, as though he was about to collapse⁷⁷. He has seen a priest who, during the commemoration of the dead in the Canon, would repeatedly incline his head toward the altar for each person commemorated, a practice which reminds Henry unfavorably of the Jewish custom of swaying during prayer⁷⁸. He recounts with some sympathy the story of a priest who, before receiving communion, would say his prayers bowed toward the sacrament standing with one foot placed upon the other. When asked the cause for this posture, the priest would reply: "*quia dominum ihesum sic stetisse in cruce recordetur*". A dog, easily agitated by congregants, caused that priest to topple over⁷⁹. He has seen even high-ranking clerics sign congregants with relics and offer them to be kissed at

⁷² Cf. supra nt. 1.

⁷³ Critical of priests who neglect to say prayers after celebrating the mass, Henry exclaims not without some sympathy; cf. M, fol. 203v: "*O piissimi domini et fratres scio quia illud ex malitia non facitis, sed ex eo solo quod ordinem rei non pensatis.*"

⁷⁴ Cf. M, fol. 198r: "*vidi consuetudinem ut de altari ad sacristiam vel ad dotem transierunt quod forte reprehensibile est.*"

⁷⁵ Cf. ibid., fol. 199r: "*Vidi tardos in canonem devotionem circumstantium in animi commotionem provocare.*"

⁷⁶ Cf. ibid.: "*paucos enim intelligentes vidi manu integra conferre.*"

⁷⁷ Cf. ibid., fol. 200v: "*Dum autem more solito in elevatione sua erecta facie hostiam diutius inspiceret quasi vertiginem sensit in capite et incepit facillare quasi velit cadere.*"

⁷⁸ Cf. ibid., fol. 201v: "*tanquam iudeus*"; the reference is apparently to the Jewish practice of swaying during prayer.

⁷⁹ Ibid., f. 202r.

the end of mass, and he has heard them attach indulgences to this practice, despite the fact that charters documenting the relics’ authenticity were lacking⁸⁰.

It is true that, unlike the allusions to canon law and sacramental theology in the manuals, these accounts serve to advise celebrants not what to do, but as examples of customs that Henry for the most part thinks are best avoided, or at least for which he proposes an alternative practice. Nonetheless, eye-witness anecdotes establish a different kind of credibility and authority in the text than that seen in the manuals. The author carefully presents himself as knowing intimately the liturgical practice of which he writes and the potential problems and various kinds of errors, or mistaken pieties, in its execution. He employs this experience to forge a bond with his readers with readily recognizable examples of performance behavior. This he augments with tips and warnings of the kind seen to a limited degree in Guido and in the ‘*Manuale sacerdotum parochialium*’, but here employed much more extensively. He discusses, for example, the danger of knocking over the chalice with one’s sleeve if one makes signs of the cross that are too long⁸¹ and the usefulness of placing the host on the corporal precisely four fingers from the foot of the chalice, so that the celebrant will not be forever worrying about tipping the chalice over or about touching the host with his chasuble or the sleeve of his alb⁸². He counsels the use in winter of hand-warmers after the *Sanctus* to avoid the numbness of fingers that might cause the excessively ascetic celebrant to drop the sacrament⁸³. Again, Henry’s provision of concrete suggestions, the import of which only other practitioners would fully understand, serves to lend the text an internal, experienced-based authority.

Secondly, with respect to the scope, the manual literature we have discussed above is concerned almost exclusively with the consecration and subsequent handling of the Body and Blood themselves; other parts of the mass liturgy or its preparation are primarily of concern only insofar as they prepare for, impede, or lead to errors in the proper execution of the consecration or reception of

⁸⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 203r–v: “*Etiam tacere nequeo quia vidi quosdam sacerdotes etiam magnatos in solemnitatibus homines offerentes cum reliquiis signare et ad oscula prebere. Audiui etiam magnas indulgentias de eisdem pronuntiare pro quibus numquam viderunt nec audiuerunt aliquam cartulam pape vel diocesani dicunt esse reliquias alicuius sancti et forte est os alicuius dampnati.*” The custom of blessing the congregants with relics after the conclusion of the mass was widespread, and while it may take its origin from the means of honoring of relics of a saint on her or his feast day at least as early as the early eleventh century, it soon became common to use relics for the concluding blessing after any solemn celebration of the Eucharist. Cf. G. J. C. Snoek, *Medieval Piety from Relics to the Eucharist: A Process of Mutual Interaction* (Studies in the History of Christian Thought 63), Leiden–New York 1995, 295–299; P. Browe, *Die Eucharistie im Mittelalter: Liturgiehistorische Forschungen in kulturwissenschaftlicher Absicht* (Vergessene Theologen 1), Berlin ²2007, 223.

⁸¹ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 199v: “*Quidam etiam longa signa faciunt. Hec quamuis sint bona quia manifesta non sunt tamen secuta quia per brachii extensionem dependens albe manica facilius pararet calicis enersionem.*”

⁸² Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 201r: “[*H*]ostia locanda est ante calicem circa spatium quattuor digitorum [...]”

⁸³ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 198v: “[*P*]ost sanctus et lotionem digitorum utile est ut tempore pruinali manus officiantes bene calefaciant ut sacramentum sine negligentia tractare valeant.”

the sacrament. In contrast, Henry's work, while indeed weighted toward a treatment of the Eucharistic Canon, treats the entirety of the rite, from before the mass begins until after it has concluded. The treatise opens with a consideration of the custom among certain priests to say before the mass a *collecta pro peccatis* while kneeling before the altar, with the intention of encouraging the devotion of the congregants. It would perhaps be better, Henry comments, for these priests to take the time actually to prepare themselves and their congregants for worship. To the imagined objection of the reader that he does not have the time for this, Henry replies laconically: "*Verum est quandoque non vacat longum, vacabit autem correptum.*"⁸⁴ The treatise concludes with an admonition to priests to devote some time to prayer after they have left the altar at the conclusion of the mass and with an exemplum and prayers that encourage and support this practice.

The scope of Henry's treatment reveals a different motivation from that of the manuals. Much of the instruction of the manuals, *cautelae*, and treatises regarding "*defectus missae*" suggest a nearly exclusive concern with avoiding potential infractions of principals of sacramental theology or of the canon law intended to safeguard the integrity of the sacrament. Henry's work has in view the fitting celebration of the Eucharistic liturgy as a whole, each of its parts being worthy of consideration independently of their relationship to the consecration and reception of the Eucharistic elements.

Thirdly, at a length of just seventeen pages copied in heavily abbreviated cursiva in what is perhaps the earliest manuscript copy, the work could hardly be considered voluminous⁸⁵. Nevertheless, its treatment of small facets of personally observed detail is unmatched in the manual literature on this subject. To select but one example: more than an entire page is devoted to the subject of whether priests should chat with people bringing offerings during the mass⁸⁶. Henry considers the practice "*illicitum*" and contrary to a truly expectant belief that the Lord will come to be present in the host. Even if the priest does not possess a devout heart, he argues, at least his behavior should be devout. He goes on, however, to commend as "*non [...] prava sed bona*" the objection of some priests that to make a semblance of devotion when one's heart is not devout is to adopt the behavior of the Pharisee: "*dicunt nolo simulare velut phariseus.*"⁸⁷ Henry responds that an edifying act of pretence is better than destructive openness, and that many are scandalized by the behavior of priests and grumble "*multa nobis dicunt que nulla faciunt*"⁸⁸. He concludes with a deft reversal of the objection, by demonstrating that what seems to be an argument against the

⁸⁴ Ibid., fol. 197r.

⁸⁵ This is the length of the treatise in M (cf. nt 1); the work is printed on nineteen two-column pages in the 1497 Augsburg edition.

⁸⁶ Cf. M (nt. 1), foll. 197r–198r.

⁸⁷ Ibid, fol. 197v.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

performance of certain ritual behaviors without concordant inner feelings is in fact a justification for them, since these actions make possible, stimulate, and safeguard interior dispositions.

It should be recalled that Henry’s criticism at the beginning of the treatise was not so much the failure of the content of the *manualia*, such that the provision of a more extensive and more detailed treatise might have some hope of curing the problem. The trouble, as Henry sees it, is less that priests do know not what to do than that they do otherwise: “*aliter procederent etsi aliter docuissent*”. In short, there is a gap between instruction based on manuals and performative practice. Confronted by the writerly cul-de-sac of how to write in a way that will overcome an apparent problem in the capacity of writing-based teaching, Henry attempts to lay out positively the reason, or reasons, for performing the rite in the certain way: “*ex vera ratio.*” What does Henry mean by this phrase?

Although there is no discrete treatment of ratio within the treatise, we can examine at least in a preliminary fashion the way that the author proceeds in his recommendations. Like his examples of methods of celebrating to avoid, Henry’s argument in favor of certain modes of ritual performance are drawn not from external authority nor from the venerable traditions of liturgical exegesis or sacramental theology. Instead, they derive from something that amounts to what we might call the practitioner’s common sense. Henry’s comments regarding the salutation before the collect at the opening of the mass may serve as an example:

“Many men say ‘*Dominus vobiscum*’ as they are turning to the people, but once they are turned around, they do not wait until they have finished their words [before turning back to the altar]. Perhaps they are embarrassed. I do not praise those who do this, for one who wants to greet others should not turn away his face until he has completed his word of greeting.”⁸⁹

Henry’s argument against such a whirl from altar to people and back again shows a pastoral instinct for what might cause a celebrant to act in this way, namely performance anxiety. At the same time, it reasserts the purpose of the rubric (greeting) over its dutiful execution and unfolds the implication of this purpose for the manner of performance (“Slow down!”). If the priest, like the stage-performer, suffers anxiety about meeting the gaze of the congregants when he turns to face them, he should, Henry counsels, look upon the Savior within.

At times, Henry’s reasoning rests entirely on pragmatic grounds. Commenting on the apparently novel practice of certain priests who even when they are not “out of their mind with the heat” were fanning themselves with the paten (instead of simply signing their faces with it at the Peace), Henry observes dryly

⁸⁹ Ibid., fol. 198r: “[*M*]ulti dicentes dominus vobiscum vertentes se ad populum non expectant versi donec compleant verba. Hoc forte verecundantur. Qui faciunt hoc non laudo quia qui vult alios salutare non debet auertere faciem donec salutis compleuit sermonem.”

that this is not a careful thing to do “because the priest could throw it in his own face, since the paten is thin”⁹⁰. When he expresses concern about what he calls an “ancient custom” of waving the corporal toward the eyes of congregants at the conclusion of the mass (“*ventilatio post missam cum corporali ad oculos circumstantium*”), his argument is again practical: good corporals are being destroyed by this custom, and a commotion is created, with people at the back growing impatient, jostling those standing ahead of them, shouting, knocking people over, hurting them, and causing others to laugh⁹¹.

Practical concern for the (unintended) consequences of ritual gestures is not limited, however, to those actions which may cause physical harm or material damage. Henry’s criticism of certain priests’ practice of anointing and sprinkling the mouths and eyes of young boys and old women with the ablutions after the celebrant’s communion, rests on carefully thinking through what the ablution is intended to do, viz., in part, to remove any residual particles of the Body which may have adhered to the celebrant’s fingers. Since it would hardly be desirable inadvertently to sprinkle particles of the Body of Christ onto the eyes and mouths of the congregants, Henry recommends instead that the priest satisfy the demand for the custom by wetting his middle finger with wine freshly poured from the cruet and use this to anoint and sprinkle⁹². Likewise, Henry deems it praiseworthy if the custom “*aput plures*” of laying the corporal on the faces of rich congregants can be avoided. Here, his concern is neither about potential damage to the corporal nor about commotion in the church, but that poor congregants observing the ritual are scandalized, and that the poor are mistakenly deemed unworthy of such treatment⁹³.

Finally, Henry employs the term “unnecessary” (*non necessarium*) as a means to argue that certain methods of celebrating, while not prohibited nor dangerous nor defective, are nonetheless ill-advised. The term succinctly expresses a not uncommon note of caution in the text about what Henry considers excessive

⁹⁰ Ibid., fol. 202r: “*Novissime quidam etiam cum patena versus faciem sunt ventilantes quamvis ex calore non sunt amentes. Hoc etiam non est cautum facere quia posset seipsum presbiter in faciem iacere, quia labile est patena.*”

⁹¹ Ibid., fol. 203r. The custom of blessing with the corporal, cross, or with the paten is evidenced at least as early as the thirteenth century in France; by the fifteenth century the custom is witnessed elsewhere in Western Europe; cf. Browe, *Die Eucharistie im Mittelalter* (nt. 80), 234 sq.; Snoek, *Medieval Piety* (nt. 80), 299. The custom appears to have arisen specifically for use by priests at the conclusion of the mass, in distinction to the episcopal benediction which was given by the hand.

⁹² Cf. ibid., fol. 202v: “[A]cepta ablutione quidam ad oculos puerorum vel vetularum stantium liniunt et spargunt. Hoc non laudo, nam species sacramenti quantumcumque modica ex casu digitis adherens posset oculis misceri. Ut autem eorum desiderio prespiter satisfaciatur madefacto medio digito in vino currente de ampulla liniant et aspergantur.”

⁹³ Cf. ibid.: “[C]onsuetudo est apud plures ut diuitibus astantibus finita missa super faciem corporale ponant. Hoc quamvis non noceat, tamen astantes pauperes scandalizat. Vbi autem competenter vitari posset laudabile esset, quia est scriptum ‘Coram ceco non ponas offendiculum’ [Lev. 19,14]. Ipsi autem pauperes suspicantur quasi non digni huius exhibitionis vel consimilis. Si autem sapienter pensari posset quia quos mundus despicit hos dominus oculis misericordie respicit.”

ritual display: he describes, for example, the actions of some priests who, after the ablutions, lick their fingers and wipe their ears and eyes as “*ostentationes pueriles – quamvis viderim eas facere sapientes*”⁹⁴. However, the notion of the “unnecessary” also affords the author room to go beyond rubric, canon, and principal of sacramental theology, beyond counsel for the avoidance of danger and the provision of practical tips, to consider possible and legitimate variants in ritual practice, without requiring the author to enumerate the reasons for his conservatism or to critique directly his fellow priests, whose Eucharistic piety he shares, though he may disagree with its expression.

Counsels not to look behind one’s back while at the altar⁹⁵ or chat with those bringing offerings⁹⁶ or leave the altar area while another priest is giving the sermon “*sine necessitate*”⁹⁷, allow the priestly reader some room for discernment regarding alternative courses of action in particular circumstances. Furthermore, the distinction Henry underlines between what is prohibited, on the one hand, and what is unnecessary, on the other⁹⁸, grants the author himself some leeway even when dealing with that most central of late-medieval Eucharistic gestures, the elevation of the consecrated Body and Blood. When considering the practice of some priests of turning the thin host this way and that so that not only the people standing behind the altar, but also those who are standing at the sides are able to see it, Henry argues that since people are so eager to see the sacrament, they often do not leave church without doing so⁹⁹. For this very reason, he concludes, somewhat tongue in cheek it seems, it might be better not to show the host to them so extensively for then they would be detained for longer in the church, and not go off to the pub! It is not, Henry insists, that he is suggesting that the host should be hidden: but these long and superfluous elevations and turnings of the host this way and that should not be done “*quantum mea concepit ratio*”¹⁰⁰.

III.

By way of conclusion, we may observe that Henry’s exploration of a kind of interior impulse to right performance and the avoidance of error is a clever instrument to solve the problem of how to write in order to overcome the problem of the inefficacy of performance-related writing, evidenced by the man-

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Cf. *ibid.*, fol. 197r.

⁹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, foll. 197r–v.

⁹⁷ Ibid., fol. 198r.

⁹⁸ When Henry describes the dangers of gazing upward too long at the host, he insists (fol. 200v): “*Nolo autem credas me velle dicere quia eleuantem sursum respicere sit prohibitum. Set dico quia non est necessarium.*”

⁹⁹ Cf. M (nt. 1), foll. 200v–201r.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., fol. 201r.

uals themselves. In place of series of instructions which digest written authorities, Henry invokes practitioners' shared experience in order to propose a kind of work-a-day authority in the common sense of the ritual performer, who no longer needs to refer to manuals and *cantelae* or their attendant source documents. In so doing, to borrow a notion of Michel de Certeau, in place of the strategies of the rubrics and manuals, Henry provides tactics of a practitioner well-versed in the art-de-faire of the mass¹⁰¹.

The emphasis on the interior knowledge of the celebrant and the estimation of the incapacity of the written text to treat errors in sacred ritual adequately and effectively is consistent with Henry's spiritual writing, which is thought to have been undertaken during his stay at the Abbey of Eberbach, between his departure from Paris and his call to the University of Vienna¹⁰². It seems appropriate to conclude this preliminary study by noting that Henry concludes the 'Secreta sacerdotum' with an exemplum of a priest he knew in his youth who, before leaving the church after mass one Pentecost, had knelt down and made a little payer, whereupon he fell into an ecstatic state with the gift of tears. When the priest came to, he attempted to use words to describe what had happened. He retained many things in his heart, Henry writes, which words could not explain: "*tantum autem sufficit cognovisse ut humilitas orationis recipit quod leuitas mentis inuenire non valuit.*"¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ Cf. M. de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life*, transl. S. F. Rendall, Berkeley–Los Angeles–London 1984, xviii–xx.

¹⁰² The three principal works of the period are: *Tractus de discretione spirituum*, ed. T. Hohmann, in: id., *Heinrichs von Langenstein 'Unterscheidung der Geister' lateinisch und deutsch: Texte und Untersuchungen zu Übersetzungsliteratur aus der Wiener Schule (Münchener Texte und Untersuchungen zu deutschen Literatur des Mittelalters 63)*, München 1977; *Speculum animae*, ed. H. Watrigant, *La 'méditation fondamentale' avant saint Ignace*, Eichgraben 1907, at 116–138; *Epistola de contemptu mundi* (addressed to the abbot of Eberbach, Jacobus of Eberbach, during Henry's sojourn in Worms in 1383), ed. G. Sommerfeldt, *Des Magisters Heinrich von Langenstein Traktate 'De contemptu mundi'*, in: *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 29 (1905), 404–412, at 406–412.

¹⁰³ M (nt. 1), fol. 204r.